# A

# DISQUISITION

Concerning the Nature of the

# SACRAMENT

OF THE

# LORD's SUPPER,

In order to ascertain the right Notion of it.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN RIVINGTON, at the *Bible* and *Crown* in *St. Paul's Church-yard.*

M.DCC.LXVI.

[ Price ONE SHILLING. ]

BRITISH MUSEUM

# A

# DISQUISITION

## Concerning the NATURE of the

# LORD's SUPPER.

AFTER the many treatiſes which have been written concerning the Lord's Supper, it may be thought needleſs to trouble the world with any more. If the Author of this tract had been of that opinion, it certainly had not been written. It is well known what different accounts have, not only in former times, but of late years likewiſe, been given of this divine Inſtitution, and how differently it hath been repreſented: And men of the ſame Church, and of the ſame perſuaſions in other reſpects, are, even now, far from being agreed in their Judgments concerning the preciſe na-

ture of this ſacred Rite, which conſtitutes the principal Part of the chriſtian Worſhip. Its general intent and meaning Chriſtians in general have a competent apprehenſion of, which may render them " meet par-" takers of this holy Myſtery." It is ſomething of a more improved and accurate Knowledge of it that is here aimed at; in order to their making it *a more reaſonable Service*, by partaking of it λογικως, rationally, as one of the fathers directs; or *with the Underſtanding*.

To this end, every ſerious Chriſtian may, from his own experience, be convinced of the neceſſity of acquiring the trueſt, cleareſt, and moſt diſtinct notion of it he can poſſibly attain unto.

For, do I profeſs myſelf a chriſtian? I muſt then think myſelf obliged to *be* one. To be a chriſtian upon principle and conviction, I muſt firſt know—have at leaſt a competent knowledge of, what it is to be one; and what I am to do, and to believe as ſuch: And this, in its full Extent, implies a Knowledge of the whole of chriſtia-

nity

nity, and of every thing that makes a part of it.

Am I in earneſt about my profeſſion? I muſt then carry my knowledge, as well as practice of it, as far, and to as high a pitch as I am able.

As I cannot think any doctrine, or opinion, any practice, rite, or cuſtom, that bears any relation to Chriſtianity, quite foreign to my enquiry; ſo I muſt think it more eſpecially incumbent upon me to inform myſelf well concerning the nature of the principal and moſt eſſential branches, the chief doctrines, the higheſt myſteries, and moſt important duties of it.

Among theſe we find the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper to ſtand in the foremoſt rank, with reſpect both to doctrine and practice; and, if a man may ſpeak from his own experience, the more imperfect and confuſed our apprehenſions concerning this great Myſtery are, the more indifferent and reluctant we ſhall be towards the celebration

of it, and the greater our diffidence, doubts, and perplexities, when we approach to celebrate it. And on the other hand, the more our notions of it clear up, and are enlarged, the more is the gloom diſperſed from off our minds, and we can contemplate upon, and frequent the euchariſtical ſervice with the greater comfort and delight: Our faith becomes more lively, rational, and well-grounded; and we can apply it with the greater preciſion.

That ſuperſtitious fear and dread, which is viſible in the countenances of ſo many chriſtians, eſpecially of the lower ſort of people, when they approach the Lord's Table, proceeds from their ignorance of the nature of this holy Rite; and many, on the other hand, eſtrange themſelves from it, for want of a due information concerning it.

What is here offered for the information of others, is the reſult of an impartial enquiry, firſt made for private Satisfaction: Not without conſulting many of the moſt eminent of our *Engliſh* Divines on the ſubject,

ject, and ſome foreign ones likewiſe: Nor without examining the tenets of the ſeveral denominations of Chriſtians; and the ſenſe of the Fathers of the Church; who lived neareſt the Time of the Inſtitution, and had a nearer View of the *Jewiſh* rites and cuſtoms, which it hath been ſuppoſed to reſemble and allude to; and from whom therefore the greater light might be expected.

The helps, indeed, of this kind, which the Writer of this treatiſe was able to have, were, from his ſituation in life, not ſo great, as, out of regard to the dignity and importance of the ſubject, and the reſpect due to the public, he could wiſh to have obtained. But whatever his recourſe to books hath, or might have been; and notwithſtanding the deference he pays to the judgment of others; the reader will find that it is not ſo great as implicitly to follow any. He profeſſeth to think for himſelf, which he hath been always accuſtomed to; and what he offers is the reſult of his own thoughts, not that of others; grounded, as he verily believes, on the Word of God,

which

which he follows, as his only ſure, and unerring guide.

Yet all that he preſumes to differ from others in is, by introducing a term, or two, with the proper Ideas annexed to them, and reaſonings from them; whereby the ſubject will be placed in ſomething of a new light, which often gives things very different appearances. The ſame object hath very diſſimilar aſpects, according to the different points of view, in which it is ſeen: And a ſmall Alteration in this reſpect is frequently attended with great advantage*.

No Words can be plainer than thoſe of our Saviour, in the inſtitution of his laſt Supper: And thus far all chriſtians are agreed concerning the meaning of them; that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are, in ſome ſenſe or other, his Body and Blood; and that we are to eat and drink them in remembrance of him: And this may be as much as is generally neceſſary for ordinary

* Μικρον ϑ μεκρον, οταν εις μαγχα εκφερη. Damaſcen conc. in *Matt.* xiii. 30. ſub initio.

chriſtians,

chriſtians, who can attain no higher notions of it.

But a corrupt part of the Chriſtian Church having put a very abſurd interpretation upon this plain and ſimple Inſtitution of our Saviour, it became neceſſary to reſcue his expreſſions from the unnatural force under which they lay: and this hath occaſioned all the embarraſſment in which this doctrine hath been involved ever ſince. For different men and churches having fallen into different ways of explaining it, ſome ſubſtituted one abſurdity for another: Others have explained it quite away: And few have kept quite clear of difficulties and objections, to which their explanations are ſeverally liable.

The moſt unexceptionable, and that which hath been adopted by the greateſt number of our moſt eminent *Engliſh* Divines, is that of Dr. *Cudworth*. That learned man revived the notion, for it had been advanced before, that as the antient ſacrifices of *Jews* and Heathens were uſually feaſted upon, or attended with Feaſts, after they had been offered;

offered; ſo in conformity to that cuſtom, the Lord's Supper was of the nature of a Feaſt on, or after a Sacrifice—a ſymbolical Feaſt commemorative of the grand Sacrifice of Chriſt offered upon the Croſs for us.

Notwithſtanding this notion hath been ſo generally received, and hath been lately eſpouſed by a learned Prelate, who hath written a treatiſe on the Lord's Supper on this plan; yet it hath not eſcaped without its opponents, both at home and abroad.

To do juſtice to it, it is proper to point out what is right, as well as what I apprehend to be wrong in it. And thus far I think it certainly right, in that it is a Feaſt on a Sacrifice: And as it is a Feaſt on the Sacrifice of Chriſt; ſo, by neceſſary implication, it admits his Death to have been a Sacrifice, and of Courſe a Satisfaction for Sin; contrary to the opinion which now ſeems to be gaining too much ground among us.

Not to repeat the objections of others, what to me ſeems moſt faulty in this notion

tion is, 1. That there is an incongruity in it. And, 2. That it falls ſhort of the full intent and meaning of the inſtitution.

There is a manifeſt incongruity in it, as it is explained, in that it doth not bear a ſufficient analogy to the feaſts on the antient ſacrifices, to ſerve as a foundation for the ſuppoſition, that this is a feaſt of the ſame nature. For thoſe feaſts were, for the moſt part, if not altogether, identically the ſame with the ſacrifices themſelves; the meats which were offered in ſacrifice being preſently afterwards feaſted upon: But the Sacrifice and Feaſt here are two things very different in nature from each other, and greatly disjoined in point of time: For the feaſt is allowed to be ſymbolical, and the Sacrifice real. And this *one Sacrifice* was *once offered* above 1700 years ago; ſince which *there hath been no more Sacrifice for Sin* *. Whereas the ſuppoſed feaſt upon it hath been continually renewed and repeated, throughout all parts and ages of the chriſtian world

* Heb. x. 12, 14, 26.

ever ſince. The Sacrifice was a proper one, the Feaſt is ſuch certainly in an improper Senſe, as thus meant: It is a Feaſt upon what doth not now exiſt in the world; upon our Lord's natural Body and Blood in their ſeparate ſtate; which are now no where in the *univerſe*, nor have been ſince his reſurrection. But if it ſhould hereafter be made out, that the Sacrifice and Feaſt in the Lord's Supper are literally one and the ſame, and that both go together in point of time: this, I ſuppoſe, will be allowed more juſt and natural, and more analogous to antient practice in this reſpect.

2. This notion is defective, and falls greatly ſhort of the full intent and meaning of the Inſtitution: As it doth not admit of any Sacrifice in the Euchariſt; which I apprehend to be the chief, and moſt eſſential part of it. Indeed the generality of Proteſtant Divines have been determined to exclude all proper or material ſacrifice out of the Euchariſt, from an exceſſive reniſtence againſt the abſurd doctrine of tranſubſtantiation; which they did not ſee how they could otherwiſe keep clear of: And

yet

yet that this is a ſacrifical rite, at leaſt, in an improper ſenſe, hath been held by the fathers in general, and likewiſe by all ſober divines, popiſh, lutheran, and reformed*.

It hath been obſerved, that ſome of the terms in which it is inſtituted are ſacrifical†: And this ſenſe of them hath been ſupported by parallel expreſſions in profane authors. The terms *Altar*, *Sacrament of the Altar*, θυσιαςηριον, which ſometimes was uſed to ſignify the place where the altar ſtood, but more properly the Altar itſelf—all theſe terms being uſed relatively to the Lord's Supper, imply it to have been underſtood as a ſacrifice. Accordingly, this holy inſtitution hath been underſtood to be a commemorative ſacrifice, in which notion I do not ſee any impropriety.

* See *Waterland* on the Euchariſt, P. 466.

† Particularly τουτο ποιειτε, which we render, *this do*, may import *this offer*; and it is uſed by *Juſtin M.* in this ſenſe. Of near affinity to this is that of *Virgil—cum faciam vitulâ pro frugibus.* That this and other ſacrifical terms are made uſe of in the Inſtitution, ſee proved in *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Vol. I. P. 36, 94.

For a commemorative ſacrifice carries no more abſurdity in it than a predictive ſacrifice, and may be as eaſily conceived: And as all the ſacrifices of the law were predictive of the great Sacrifice of Chriſt, why may not this of the goſpel be commemorative of it? It hath been held, moreover, to be a repreſentative ſacrifice; and this notion of it is allowed to be conſiſtent enough with a ſacrifice: For though we are told, 'That of a commemorative ſacrifice we 'have no inſtance in practice, and can ſee 'no propriety in idea; yet a repreſentative 'ſacrifice is very good ſenſe, and may be 'well ſupported in the command to *Abra-* '*ham* to offer up his ſon *.'

But this is aſſerting too much. All the *Jewiſh* paſſovers celebrated after the *Exodus* were commemorative of the firſt paſſover: the expreſs will of God requiring them, when they celebrated their yearly paſſover, to call to mind the firſt inſtitution of it in the land of *Egypt*, with the hiſtory of what went before, and followed after it: it

* Rational Account of the Lord's Supper, P. 52.

would

would be difficult, likewiſe, I might ſay impoſſible, to exclude the idea of commemoration from the repreſentation of any thing paſt, as the latter is incluſive of the former.

The Lord's Supper was in both theſe reſpects called a ſacrifice by the fathers, as it was both a commemoration and a repreſentation of the Sacrifice of Chriſt. To inſtance only in St. *Cyprian*: 'We make 'mention of his (Chriſt's) paſſion, ſays he, 'in all our ſacrifices; for the paſſion of the 'Lord is the ſacrifice which we offer*.' This is the doctrine of *Firmilian*, and many others†. And as Mr. *Mede* well obſerves, there may be a Sacrifice, which is a repreſentation of another Sacrifice; and yet a ſacrifice too‡. To which we may add, by parity of reaſon, that there may be a Sacrifice likewiſe, commemorative of a Sacrifice, and nevertheleſs a ſacrifice ſtill. Some divines have choſen rather to make uſe of the term ſymbol, and to call the Eucha-

* *Cypr*, Epiſt. 63. Vide etam, Epiſt. 75. P. 223.
† See *Waterland*, P. 46.
‡ *Mede*'s Chriſtian Sacrifice, P. 469. of his Works.

riſt

riſt a Symbolical Sacrifice *: Becauſe, I ſuppoſe, this conveys a fuller idea of the nature of it, as being a repreſentation of the grand Sacrifice, under the ſymbols of bread and wine.

Thus have the ſoundeſt of our proteſtant divines, in conformity to the antients, held the Euchariſt to be a Sacrifice; with this only difference, that they were obliged to annex ſome cautionary term, to guard their ſenſe againſt the erroneous and abſurd doctrine of the church of *Rome*, concerning the ſacrifice of the maſs; which it maintains to be, not only of the very ſame nature, but the ſame in ſubſtance and identity with the archetypal Sacrifice of Chriſt on the croſs; and in which they alledge, Chriſt is offered hypoſtatically, both in body and ſoul, both in his divine and human nature.

And yet, notwithſtanding all the care and caution which hath been obſerved, and the many different views in which this

* See *Waterland*, ib. P. 515.

great

great myſtery hath been repreſented and explained, it continues to be pretty much a myſtery ſtill; and neither *the plain account*, nor *the rational* account of it, ſeem to give ſuch full ſatisfaction, as to be entirely acquieſced in, and render all farther enquiry needleſs. The former ſinks this divine ordinance far beneath the dignity of its nature: The latter doth not raiſe it to its due height, as it is defective in ſo eſſential a part. How that defect may be ſupplied, will, I conceive, appear preſently.

To this end, I deſire the elements in the Euchariſt may only be conſidered as ſigns, figures, or ſymbols of the body and blood of Chriſt. This is agreeable to the church of *England*'s definition of them in her catechiſm and articles; and will be readily allowed by all, who do not hold them to be tranſubſtantiated into, or conſubſtantiated with, his natural body and blood. It will be farther granted, that this holy inſtitution is of the ſame nature, import, and ſignificancy, as when it was firſt ordained by Chriſt—and that it had then, and hath

had

had ever ſince, at leaſt as near a relation and reference to the ſacrifice which he offered of himſelf on the croſs, as the *Jewiſh* ſacrifices had; it having been inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf with ſuch expreſs reference to it, as to give the bread and wine the very terms of his body and blood. The *Jewiſh* ſacrifices were not appointed by him, otherwiſe than they might have been, if, as many learned men hold, he were the *Jehovah* of the Old Teſtament. They were not appointed with any expreſs reference to his ſacrifice; nor doth it appear, that they were underſtood by the *Jewiſh* church in general to have had any reference to it. Notwithſtanding, I only aſk at preſent, that the Chriſtian Euchariſt may be allowed to ſtand upon the ſame foot of reference to the Sacrifice of Chriſt with the *Jewiſh* ſacrifices; from its analogy with which, I apprehend, it can beſt be illuſtrated.

The ſacrifice of the Paſchal Lamb, and the reſt of the *Jewiſh* ſacrifices, were all *Shadows of good Things to come*, Heb. x. 1. and I think are, on all hands, allowed to have been typical of the great and more perfect

perfect ſacrifice of Chriſt on the croſs; who was the lamb ſlain in types and figures, as well as in deſign and intention, from the beginning of the world. This is ſo well known and unconteſted a doctrine, that I need not go about to produce any proof or authority concerning it. Take the ſenſe of one of the laſt writers on the Euchariſt, which carries the greater weight, as it makes but little for his purpoſe: 'The 'rites and ceremonies of the law, ſays 'he, were typical. This ſacred rite, mean-'ing the Lord's Supper, which, together 'with baptiſm, was to take place of the 'whole *Jewiſh* ritual, is, like that ritual, 'typical alſo; but with this difference: 'The *Jewiſh* rites were predictive of 'things future, and ſo were obſcure and 'intricate: This, ſignificative of a thing 'paſt, and ſo clear and intelligible *.'

The learned writer was not here far from what I apprehend to be the true notion of the Lord's Supper; had not the opinion

* Rational Account, P. 2.

he eſpouſed of a Feaſt on a Sacrifice, carried him off from it, and made him loſe ſight of it again. Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, he ſays, are like the rites of the law, typical. They have a right to be ſo conſidered on ſeveral accounts. I am at preſent concerned but with one of theſe ſacred ordinances. The elements in the Euchariſt were expreſsly appointed by Chriſt himſelf, to repreſent his Body and Blood; and the uſe of them was by him declared to be, that they might *ſhew forth his Death.* The old types before and under the law had reference, not only to the death of Chriſt, but to the Sacrament of his Body and Blood likewiſe, which the antient church underſtood them to be typical of. The water of the flood was typical of that of baptiſm, which is expreſsly called its antitype, by 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. Ω και ημας αντιτυπον νυν σωζει βαπτισμα. *Melchiſedeck*'s bread and wine is ſo interpreted by St. *Cyprian* and other fathers: And the mincha, or bread-offering, in *Mal.* i. 11. was looked on as typical of the ſacrament, by * Mr. *Mede* and

* See Mr. *Mede*'s Chriſtian Sacrifice,

others

others among the moderns *. The paſſover under the law was typical of it likewiſe, and a great analogy hath been obſerved between the two inſtitutions †. Theſe were, therefore, types of Types; and conſequently were more diſtant and obſcure, leſs perfect and leſs efficacious, than the bread and wine in the Euchariſt; which were antitypes to them, and more direct and immediate types of the Death of Chriſt.

Theſe latter therefore may, by juſt conſtruction of ſpeech, be properly reckoned types; and the moſt certain, moſt excellent, and moſt ſignificant of all others. They muſt accordingly typify the great archetype

* *Johnſon*, ib. Vol. I. P. 155. Vol. II. P. 56, 87.

† The Paſchal Lamb was called, גופו של פסח, the *Body* of the paſſover: So Chriſt, our paſſover, who was ſacrificed for us, declared the bread to be his *Body*. The *Head of the Family* pronounced a bleſſing over the Paſchal Lamb; after which, he divided, or carved, and then diſtributed it: Chriſt, the head of his family, the church, having taken the bread, bleſſed, brake, and gave it to the diſciples. Other reſemblances might be mentioned between the Lord's Supper and the paſſover, as well as the other ſolemn feaſts of the *Jews*: But theſe latter I ſhall not inſiſt upon, as he ſeems only to have retained their uſages in theſe ſolemnities, and accommodated himſelf to them in his inſtitution of this Sacrament; to render it the more conformable to the rites and inſtitutions of the *Jewiſh* church.

in the moſt exact and fulleſt manner, to make their reſemblance of it as juſt and adequate as the nature of things will bear. Whatever, therefore, is intended by the Death of Chriſt, muſt be intended by theſe Types of it likewiſe; otherwiſe they are imperfect: They are not truly Types: Conſequently, if Chriſt's Death was a Sacrifice, this muſt be a Sacrifice too; the one real, the other typical. And this is what I apprehend to be the true notion and nature of the Lord's Supper, namely, that it is *a typical Sacrifice*—typical of Chriſt's Sacrifice after the event, as the *Jewiſh* ſacrifices were previouſly typical of it.

I beg leave to offer ſome conſiderations in ſupport of this opinion. I. This notion differs very little from that which is commonly received, excepting in the terms here propoſed; which are not very different neither from ſuch as have been in common uſe. Though I muſt own I have not met with any among either antients or moderns, who in direct terms have called the Lord's Supper *a typical Sacrifice*; or who have conſidered and reaſoned upon it as ſuch, deducing

ducing the uſes, and making the proper application of the terms. We ſhall, however, find ſufficient authority from both for the ſeparate Uſe of them.

The Elements in the Euchariſt, as hath been obſerved, are generally explained, and underſtood, as ſigns, figures, tokens, or ſymbols. Now theſe terms differ very little, if at all, in their ſignification, from that of types, excepting that this latter is ſomething more expreſſive, as the impreſſion of a ſeal is a more exact and lively repreſentation of it, than any other emblem or deſcription which could be deviſed: And a type is nothing elſe; and yet, how it hath happened I know not, this expreſſive term hath very ſeldom, ſcarce indeed at all, unleſs as it were by accident, and tranſiently, been applied to the elements in the Lord's Supper, by the modern divines. It hath been very frequently ſo applied by the antients, of which many inſtances might be produced. I ſhall content myſelf with a very few. St. *Cyril*, of *Jeruſalem*, expreſſes himſelf clearly thus—Εν τυπω αρτυ διδοται σοι

το σωμα· και εν τυπω οινε διδοται σοι το αιμα*. And accordingly the body and blood he elſewhere as clearly calls antitypes of the bread and wine: Γευομενοι γαρ ουκ αρτε και οινε κελευονται γευσασθαι, αλλα αντιτυπα σωματος και αιματος τε Χριςε. *Origen*, in a paſſage cited as his, ſeems to forbid the Bread in the Euchariſt to be taken as a type of Chriſt's Body—ινα μη νομιζη τις τυπον ειναι.——But he means no more than to raiſe up vulgar minds from grovelling apprehenſions to heavenly contemplations, and to lift up their thoughts from the type to the antitype: For *Origen* himſelf elſewhere calls it the typical Body of Chriſt——και ταυτα μεν περι τε τυπικε και συμβολικε σωματος †. Not to inſiſt farther on the judgment of ſingle perſons, however reſpectable, I ſhall once for all produce that of a cloud of witneſſes, and thoſe as wiſe and upright a body of men as ever aſſembled on the like

* St. *Cyril* Catechef. Myſtagog. IV. P. 292. ib. V. P. 300. Ed. Oxon. Where may be ſeen a recital of the *Surſum Corda*, and of ſome other parts of the communion ſervice in the antient liturgies, which are retained in the communion ſervice of the church of *England*.

† *Orig.* in *Matt.* P. 254. Ed. *Huet.*

occaſion,

occaſion, excepting none, but the firſt council of *Jeruſalem* only: I mean the council of *Conſtantinople*; which inſiſts upon the Elements in the Euchariſt being the only type or image of Chriſt to the excluſion of all others. The ſecond council of *Nice*, which met in oppoſition to it, allows them to have been, by ſome fathers, called ſuch, before conſecration, but not after; the falſity of which laſt poſition is acknowledged by *Du Pin**.

II. That the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper hath been eſteemed a Sacrifice of the chriſtian church, in ſome ſenſe or other, by the fathers in general, and by the moſt knowing and ſober among the modern divines of all denominations, was obſerved before. Now do but join theſe two ideas together, thoſe of a Type and Sacrifice, and we have the true and full import of this ſacred rite. Whence it may be called a *typical Sacrifice*; which is only a more proper and expreſſive term, than what it hath

* Eccl. Hiſt. Cent. VIII. P. 142.

been

been called by—a commemorative, repreſentative, or ſymbolical ſacrifice. It hath likewiſe the ſanction of the *Jewiſh* and chriſtian churches, in the familiar uſe and application of it to the legal ſacrifices: Whereas thoſe other terms are of later invention. They were thought of uſe to explain the doctrine, which was a ſufficient reaſon for the introduction of them: And the ſame reaſon will hold for introducing any other, that may better anſwer the ſame end, though it had no warrant or authority from antiquity to ſupport it.

III. As types and typical ſacrifices under the law were ſhadows prefiguring good things to come under the goſpel diſpenſation, it might hence be thought that they were confined in their uſe and application to prefigure future things only, and that they could not properly have any Relation to Things paſt—that as, upon the appearance of the ſubſtance all uſe of *Jewiſh* types ceaſed, ſo it might be ſuppoſed there was no uſe for any other; and this might be the reaſon why the uſe of the very term type was laid aſide. This

ſeems

ſeems to have been Dr. *Cudworth*'s notion, when he ſays, 'that legal ſacrifices being 'types of the true Chriſtian Sacrifice; and 'this being come, and once offered, we 'have now no more typical ſacrifices left 'among us, but only feaſts on the true ſa-'crifice*.' But though the typical ſacrifices of the law are ceaſed, this doth not hinder, but that other ſacrifices, typical of the grand ſacrifice, might be inſtituted in their ſtead under the goſpel. For though the predictive types of the *Jewiſh* ritual ceaſed, upon their being fulfilled in Chriſt; that was ſo far from precluding the inſtitution of other types, or typical obſervances under the goſpel; which might have a retroſpect to, and be commemorative of things paſt; that the analogy of the one to the other ſhould rather be an argument in their favour: And it is much this had not led the learned writer into the notion I am pleading for, rather than into that which he eſpouſed.

That all uſe of types is not diſcontinued under the goſpel, appears from many in-

* True notion of the Lord's Supper, P. 8.

ſtances in the New Teſtament. The water in the other ſacrament, baptiſm, is typical of the ſpiritual uſe and efficacy of that rite, in cleanſing and purifying us from our ſins. The deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on our Saviour, in the form of a dove, typified his innocence, and the purity of the Holy Spirit. And his deſcent on the apoſtles, on the day of *Pentecoſt*, in the appearance of cloven tongues, like as of fire, was typical of the gift of tongues, accompanied by that fervent zeal, with which they were endowed for preaching the goſpel. Our Saviour's parables were generally typical: and ſo were ſome of his miracles. St. *Paul* makes uſe of allegorical reaſoning, which is founded on types. The bond and free woman are typical of the two covenants, and of the earthly, and heavenly *Jeruſalem*, *Gal.* iv. 24. And we have one goſpel-prophecy, at leaſt, fulfilled in an event which it foretold, and that generally underſtood to be typical of another greater event, yet to come, by which the prophecy is to be fully and finally accompliſhed. I mean the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, which is looked upon

upon as being typical of the diſſolution of all things *.

If we conſider the nature of the thing, a type muſt be poſterior to the thing typified, as the impreſſion is to the ſeal. There muſt be a ſubſtance before there can be a ſhadow; and the figure or likeneſs of the thing ſuppoſes the previous exiſtence of the thing itſelf. And though the types of the *Moſaic* diſpenſation did in time precede their antitypes, yet they were made according to the patterns ſeen by *Moſes* in the mount †.

* Receptum erat apud Helleniſtas, & N. Teſtamenti ſcriptores, Helleniſticorum dogmatum ſequaces, ut rerum omnium terreſtrium, præſertim earum quæ ad religionem ſpectabant, exemplaria crederentur in cœlis archetypa, quæ παραδειγματα vocat auctor ad Hebræos, cap. iv. ver. 23. ad quarum ſimilitudinem expreſſa fuerint ectypa omnia, quæ illis reſpondebant, terreſtria. Imo ut vera illa ſola fuerint cœlorum archetypa. Sic arcæ Moſaicæ reſpondebat apoſtoli σκηνη in cœlis αληθινη. Sic templo Salomonis æternum aliud ab initio cœleſte, cujus meminit auctor libri Sapientiæ, cap. ix. ver. 8. Sic urbi Hieroſolymitanæ urbs alia in cœlis Hieroſolymitana, quæ mater eſt peculii myſtici. *Gal.* iv. 25, 26. Συστοιχιαν appellat apoſtolus cœleſtium illorum, archetyporum, terreſtriumque ectyporum convenientiam.

Dodwellus in annot. ad Grabii Spicil. Patrum, Tom. i. P. 339.

† *Exod.* xxv. 40. *Acts* vii. 24. *Heb.* viii. 5.—ix. 23.

To convince us, that there is no impropriety in the uſe of types, with relation to things paſt, any more than future, I ſhall produce an inſtance in fact of the ſame typical rite or ſacrifice looking both backward and forward; and that of near affinity to the preſent ſubject. The *Jewiſh* paſſover, in the place of which the Chriſtian Euchariſt ſucceeded; and which, as we have ſeen, it reſembled in many reſpects, was obſerved in remembrance of the angels paſſing over the *Iſraelites*, and of their deliverance from the *Egyptian* bondage: And this likewiſe was a ſpecial type of Chriſt, the true Paſchal Lamb ſlain before the foundation of the world, but to be offered in due time. This appears from the expreſs words of the apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* v. 7, 8. *Chriſt our Paſſover is ſacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feaſt*—the Paſchal Feaſt upon this ſacrificed Chriſt *. The paſſover was inſtituted previouſly both to the angel's paſſing over the *Iſraelites*, and to their deliverance from the *Egyptian* bondage: The

* See *Cudworth*, ib. P. 16.

Lord's

Lord's Supper, in like manner, at his inſtitution of it, typified his death to come; as in all ſucceeding celebrations of it, this holy rite typified his death paſt. There is, then, nothing in the notion of a type inconſiſtent with the ſpiritual nature of the chriſtian worſhip, much leſs in the types I am pleading for, as will preſently appear: There is, therefore, no impropriety in goſpel-types at all.

IV. As there ſhould always be ſome reſemblance or analogy between the type and antitype, here is as great and proper a one as needs be deſired. The Paſchal Lamb, we have juſt obſerved, was a lively type of Chriſt, who was a lamb brought to the ſlaughter without ſpot or blemiſh. *Iſaac*, who was devoted by his father to be offered in ſacrifice by the command of God, was ſtill a livelier type of the Son of God laying down his life for us, according to the will of the Father: The one an animal ſacrifice, the other human; both in thoſe ages much in uſe: Though God would not ſuffer the latter to be actually ſlain. A reſemblance of this kind was inconſiſtent

conſiſtent with the purer and more ſpiritual goſpel diſpenſation: A reſemblance notwithſtanding was preſerved in a more refined, and no leſs apt and expreſſive a manner. The bread broken and wine effuſed have an aptitude to repreſent the wounded and crucified body, and effuſed blood of Chriſt. Bread and wine, in reſpect of their nouriſhing qualities, likewiſe, are the moſt proper types of Chriſt's body and blood, by which our ſouls are nouriſhed unto everlaſting life. The wine, moreover, hath a ſtrong reſemblance of blood: But the bread not having any to a human body, was wiſely ordained for the purpoſe; leſt, if it had repreſented the figure of a man, idolatry ſhould be introduced under that colour, as the ſynod of *Conſtantinople*, above-mentioned, juſtly obſerved. And yet, notwithſtanding this precaution, the very bread hath been made an occaſion of idolatry; while the blood hath been in ſo little danger in this reſpect, that it hath been baniſhed the ſacrament, and withdrawn from the whole body of the laity in the communion of the church of *Rome*; though what they have retained for the uſe

of the prieſts hath not eſcaped without abuſe. For they mix a little water with it, and this they maintain then changes its nature, and is converted into wine: Thus contriving to extract a ſmall miracle even out of this: As if it had been their profeſſed deſign to pollute every thing they laid their hands on.

To proceed, As the blood of the ſacrifices under the law typified the blood of Chriſt ſhed on the altar of the croſs; ſo doth the wine in the Lord's Supper: And the blood of Chriſt is the antitype of both; and the one typical ſervice anſwers to the other *. But there were other types before and under the law, which came nearer the genius of the goſpel. *Melchiſedeck*, prieſt of the moſt high God, after whoſe order of prieſthood Chriſt himſelf was, *offered Bread and Wine*, *Gen.* xiv. 18. This was touched upon before, as was the *Mincha*, or pure-offering, *Mal.* i. 11. foretold to be *offered in every Place, a pleaſant Offering unto the Lord, as in the Days of old, and as in for-*

* See *Waterland*, ib. P. 463.

*mer*

*mer Years*, Chap. iii. 4. which text points out the alluſion of theſe offerings, under either diſpenſation to each other, if it doth not intimate the ſameneſs of them. The *manna* in the wilderneſs was ſpiritual food; and the water which flowed out of the rock was ſpiritual drink; and the rock itſelf *was Chriſt*, as St. *Paul* expreſsly interprets, 1 *Cor.* x. 4. Theſe aptly correſpond with the bread and wine in the ſacrament: For the *Iſraelites did all eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat, and did all drink the ſpiritual drink* which Chriſtians do; only under different types, and in a fainter light. We enjoy the ſame bleſſings under clearer and brighter manifeſtations.

In a word, under the goſpel, the bread broken and eaten, and the wine poured out and drunk, are expreſsly appointed as ſignificant ſigns, ſymbols, or, as I beg leave to ſay, types of our Lord's wounded body, and of his blood ſhed, on which we ſpiritually feed, and ſhew forth his death in a plainer, more manifeſt, and fuller aſſurance of faith and knowledge, than could

be

be conveyed under the ſhadows of the law. As the goſpel itſelf is a clearer revelation than the law; ſo are theſe ſacramental types of clearer ſignification and application than any of the legal ones; and are likewiſe of a higher and more excellent nature, as they are parts of a higher and more excellent inſtitution.

But unleſs we affix clear and determinate names and ideas to theſe ſacred elements—while we are at a loſs what to call them—whether ſigns, figures, or ſymbols of things, or the things themſelves—whether they are of a ſacrifical nature, or only feaſts on a ſacrifice—and if ſacrifical, in what ſenſe, or what kind of ſacrifice they conſtitute.—If we are under any ſuch uncertainties concerning this holy inſtitution, the veil of the law will be extended to the goſpel, and remain even until this day untaken away; if the rites and ſacrifices of the law will not even have the advantage of the ordinances of the goſpel, in point of clearneſs and preciſion. Let us agree upon ſome proper and ſignificant terms, and that will fix our vague and fluctuating conceptions, and draw them to a point. And till ſome more proper and

ſignificant terms can be found, let the Lord's Supper be called, *a typical ſacrifice.*

V. The ſacrament of the Lord's Supper, as that of baptiſm, hath by divines been proved to be a federal rite: The ſeals of the covenant are the bread and wine: For theſe are the means and pledges, whereby the benefits of it are conveyed, on God's part, and received on ours: And the death of Chriſt is the valuable conſideration on which the covenant is founded; and it is ratified in his blood, as covenants antiently were made and ratified by the blood of the ſacrifices; and as Chriſt himſelf explains it, *This is my blood of the new covenant*, Matt. xxvi. 20. And, *This is the new covenant in my blood*, Mark xiv. 24. The bread and wine are the viſible inſtruments or pledges, by which the rights and benefits of the covenant are conveyed and ſealed to us. Hence they may in juſt conſtruction be deemed the outward ſeals of it. Now what can give us a juſter idea of the propriety of them for this purpoſe, than this very conſideration, that they are the types and ſignatures of that body

and

and blood in which the covenant is ratified and confirmed; and that they are, as I may ſay, the expreſs image of them, by which that body and blood, together with all their benefits, are conveyed to us? To what elſe, to what other image, can the apoſtle ſo well be ſuppoſed to allude, when he tells us, that the *law* had *a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things*, Heb. x. 1.

In a word, the faith of chriſtians, in the meritorious death and paſſion of their Lord, cannot be kept up, throughout all the ſucceſſive ages of his church, in any ſo effectual a manner, as that under conſideration. The reſemblance implied in the notion of a type doth in a manner graphically delineate his crucified body before our eyes. The idea of a ſacrifice, with which that of a type is joined, raiſes its eſtimation above that of a bare type; and a ſacrifice, typical of the grand ſacrifice of Chriſt on the croſs, muſt be a moſt lively and effectual means of exhibiting and applying the great antitype to our hearts and ſouls; together with all

the ineſtimable benefits of it: While the type, at the ſame time, by its very nature, as it is a type, preſerves its due diſtance and diſtinction from its awful original.

St. *Paul* upbraids the *Galatians* with their unbelief, after that, as he tells them, *Jeſus Chriſt had been evidently ſet forth*, or as the word * may be rendered, *depictured before* their eyes. This paſſage is ſuppoſed by ſome to relate to the holy communion, which, of all parts of the chriſtian worſhip, repreſents our crucified Saviour in the ſtrongeſt manner to his diſciples; but doth not, if I may uſe the expreſſion, draw him ſo much to the life, under any notion of it, as under that of a type, which is here recommended. The following remark is very pertinent to the preſent purpoſe: 'It 'is not unworthy of notice, that the apoſtle, 'in a paſſage wherein he reminds his con-'verts of their having received the Lord's 'Supper, makes uſe of a figurative expreſ-

* *Gal.* iii. 1. Προεγραφη, προ, *i. e.* εμπροσθεν. In this ſenſe, προγραμμα is a writing ſet up in any public place, to be expoſed to open view. See *Hammond* on *Jude* 1.

'ſion

'ſion derived from the art of painting, 'Χριστος προεγραφη, ſaith he, *Gal.* iii. 1. which 'laſt word is rendered in the *Syriac* verſion, '*quaſi figurando, pictus erat* *; and which 'properly denotes, that the bread and wine, 'which our Saviour inſtituted, contained 'the ſame kind of repreſentation of his 'paſſion, as if given by delineation and 'colours. We find alſo that the apoſtle 'uſeth a figurative expreſſion of a ſimilar 'nature.' *Heb.* x. 1. †

The expreſſion here referred to is that above taken notice of, that *the Law had a Shadow of good Things to come*, and not αυτην την εικονα, *the very Image of the Things*; which implies, that the goſpel had that very image of them, taken from the things themſelves; and this is a remarkable inſtance of it. For the apoſtle is here making a compariſon between the law and the goſpel, ſhewing the preference of the latter, and how it was perfective of the other.

* In the Polyglot tranſlation of that verſion it is rendered, *ecce quaſi pingendo depictus fuerat coram oculis veſtris*, in much the ſame ſenſe.

† The Ornaments of Churches conſidered, P. 67.

VI. This

VI. This notion of the Lord's Supper, I apprehend, is attended with the feweſt difficulties, and helps to the ſolution of many objections, which have lain againſt this divine ordinance, for want only of its being righty underſtood.

As in popular language the pourtrait of a perſon is called by the name of the perſon for whom it is drawn; ſo the ſcripture abounds with inſtances of the name of the antitype being given to the type. *This is Jeruſalem*, that is, the ſhaven hair, which was typical of it, *Ezek.* v. 5. *Theſe bones are the whole houſe of Iſrael*, ch. xxxvii. 11. *Thou art the head of gold*, Dan. ii. 38. Thou, Nebuchadnezzar, art typified by it. *The ten horns are ten kings*, ch. vii. 24. Rev. xvii. 12. *The ſeven heads are ſeven muntains, and ſeven kings*, ib. ver. 9, 10. *The waters which thou ſaweſt are people and multitudes, and nations and Tongues*, ver. 15. *The woman is the great city*, ver. 18. To come nearer to the purpoſe, the *Rock was Chriſt*, 1 Cor. x. 4. Accordingly, the language of ſcripture is the ſame, with regard to ſacraments, calling

The

the types, or repreſenting ſigns by the names of the things which they repreſent. Thus the Paſchal Lamb is called the paſſover; and the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper is, in the ſame ſanſe, called the body and blood of Chriſt.

Now there is no more reaſon for concluding from the words of this inſtitution, *This is my Body*, that the bread is tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt, than there is from the apoſtle's expreſſion, *The Rock was Chriſt*, that the rock was converted into his very perſon, or that there was a real and material change of all, or any of the fore-mentioned types into the ſubſtance of their antitypes. And while we look upon the bread and wine in the ſacrament, as types of Chriſt's body and blood, this will guard againſt the ſuppoſition, and impoſition, of any ſuch change—will preſerve a ſufficient diſtinction in our ideas, and we ſhall be in no danger of running them into each other, by eſpouſing the notions, either of tranſubſtantiation, or conſubſtantiation: For the type cannot in any ſenſe, but a figurative one, be the thing typified

by

by it, though it be ever ſo plainly, or ever ſo often, called by its name. It was not till after Chriſt had bleſſed and diſtributed the elements, and commanded the diſciples to partake of them, that he declared them to be his body and blood; intimating that they were ſuch only in the uſe of them, and not in themſelves; not in nature, but in figure and conſtruction.

Dr. *Waterland* obſerves, That the *Romaniſts* have ſo often, and ſo grievouſly abuſed the once innocent names of oblation, ſacrifice, propitiation, *&c.* perverting them to an ill ſenſe, and grafting falſe doctrine and falſe worſhip upon them, that the proteſtants have been juſtly jealous of admitting theſe names, or ſcrupulouſly wary and reſerved in the uſe of them *. But the term of a typical ſacrifice may be uſed without reſerve, and without any danger of being abuſed for the purpoſes of either falſe doctrine or falſe worſhip. And we may ſafely admit, with Mr. *Mede*, of a

* *Waterland*, ib. P. 466.

proper

proper and material ſacrifice, in the Euchariſt; the ſacrifice of bread and wine, analogous to the *Mincha* of the old law *: Notwithſtanding learned men are ſo loath to come into this doctrine, which yet they have in vain endeavoured to explain away.

It is painful, for inſtance, to ſee ſo judicious a divine as Dr. *Waterland* labour thro' a great number of pages, to exclude all material ſacrifices and oblations of every kind out of the Chriſtian ſervice †. Alms and oblations he diſtinguiſhes away; the matter of which, he ſays, is not accepted by God, but only the ſervice: And yet, ſtrictly ſpeaking, it is the matter, and that only, which is the proper ſubject of the offering. Our bodies, likewiſe, are a goſpel ſacrifice, than which there is none other more earneſtly preſſed, nor, in ſeveral reſpects, more highly recommended. *I beſeech you, Brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye preſent your bodies a living ſacrifice, holy acceptable unto*

* *Mede*'s Works, P. 355.
† *Waterland*, ib. P. 475, & ſeq.

*God, which is your reaſonable ſervice*, Rom. xii. 1. Which ſingle text, if this learned man had impartially conſidered, he could not have contended ſo much for rejecting every thing material from the ſervice of chriſtians. For chriſtians, like all other men, are made up of body, as well as ſoul, and are to ſerve God in both. We need not, therefore, ſcruple to allow the Euchariſt to be a true, and proper, and likewiſe a material ſacrifice, with regard to the elements uſed in it: And while we maintain it to be a typical ſacrifice withal, let our adverſaries make their advantage of this conceſſion.

*Juſtin M. Irenæus*, and others, among the antients, and Biſhop *Bull*, and Dr. *Grabe*, as well as Mr. *Mede*, above taken notice of in this reſpect, among the moderns, gave great countenance to the doctrine of a proper and material ſacrifice in the Euchariſt *. We may ſafely join them on this footing.

* *Juſtin M.* Dial. P. 220. *Iren.* lib. iv. cap 17, 32. *Cum Grabii, annot.* Biſhop *Bull*'s Anſwer to the Biſhop of *Meaux*, P. 18, 19.

It ſeems neceſſary to admit the Euchariſt to be a true proper ſacrifice, to qualify it for being a repreſentative or typical one; which it cannot properly be, without the eſſentials of a ſacrifice. Such were the immolations under the law. The annual Paſchal Lamb was not only commemorative of the firſt Paſchal Lamb, but alſo in itſelf, excluſively of that reſpect, an entire proper ſacrifice: And at the ſame time it was typical, or repreſentative, of the true Paſchal Lamb offered upon the croſs. And I am loath to admit the chriſtian ſacrifice of bread and wine to be in any reſpect inferior to the ſacrifices under the law.

If the notion of a material ſacrifice in the Lord's Supper be allowed, we need not ſcruple the promiſcuous uſe of the terms *altar* and *table*—terms much controverted about the middle of the laſt century; neither need we have recourſe to the diſtinction between a material and ſpiritual altar, which ſome have thought expedient. As the ſacrifices offered upon our altars are typical, we may, if we pleaſe, call them typical altars; and we have *Greg. Nazianzen*'s authority for

it—Θυσιασηριων ειρξεσιν; αλλ' οιδα και αλλο θυσιασηριον ου τυποι τα νυν ορωμενα *. Theſe viſible altars, ſays he, are but types of that inviſible or ſpiritual one, to which he could always have recourſe, on which he could always meditate, and from which no one could debar him. He elſewhere calls the outward ſacrifice of bread and wine, the antitype of the great myſteries. Πως εμελλον θαρρησαι προσφερειν αυτῳ την εξωθεν θυσιαν, την των μεγαλων μυσηριων αντιτυπον †: The term, antitype, was ſometimes uſed, tho' improperly, inſtead of, and in the ſame ſenſe with that of type; ſo that he here reckons the outward ſacrifice of the Lord's Supper, as typical of the great myſteries: as he calls the ſacrifice of Chriſt (by way of alluſion to the heathen myſteries, ſome of which were greater than others) and of which we could only be partakers by the inward and inviſible application of faith. Accordingly, he above calls the viſible altars, on which theſe outward ſacrifices had been offered, types of the then inviſible altar of the croſs.

* *Greg. Naz.* Orat. xxviii. P. 484. Ed. *Paris.*
† Ib. Orat. i. P. 38.

It hath been much controverted, whether our Saviour's diſcourſe, *John* vi. 27—63. is to be underſtood of oral manducation in the Euchariſt, or of ſpiritual manducation in general; not to mention other interpretations which have been given of that chapter. As on the one hand there are ſeveral expreſſions in that diſcourſe, which cannot, without violence, be interpreted of the communion in an excluſive ſenſe; ſo from the terms made uſe of, as well as from the general import of the whole diſcourſe, it appears to have eſpecial reference to the Euchariſt: And the intent of it ſeems to have been to prepare the minds of the diſciples for the inſtitution of it.

Now, if we admit the notion of a typical body, we may, I think, more clearly and diſtinctly conceive both an oral, and ſpiritual manducation in the Euchariſt.——An oral manducation of the typical body; and a ſpiritual manducation of the real body of Chriſt on the croſs: The former common to the worthy and unworthy receiver in the Euchariſt only; the latter peculiar to the worthy receiver and the true chriſtian; it being

being an exerciſe of a true and lively faith in Chriſt, and in the benefits of his death; which may be performed at other times, and on other occaſions; but always is performed by ſuch in an eſpecial manner in the Euchariſt.

I obſerved above, p. 9, That the notion of the Lord's Supper being a feaſt upon a ſacrifice, had an impropriety or incongruity in it, as the ſacrifice, and the feaſt upon that ſacrifice were not of the ſame nature; but that the one was real, the other only ſymbolical: Whereas the antient ſacrifices, and the feaſts upon them, were not only of the ſame nature, but identically the ſame, with regard to the matter of them—That there was a farther impropriety in ſuppoſing a preſent feaſt upon a paſt ſacrifice——upon a ſacrifice paſt 1700 years ago.—That it was likewiſe partial and defective, and fell greatly ſhort of the full intent of the inſtitution, in not admitting any ſacrifice in the Euchariſt; which I look upon to be the moſt eſſential part of it. Now theſe ſeveral objections are removed, as I promiſed they ſhould be, p. 10, upon the

ſuppoſition

ſuppoſition of a typical ſacrifice. For admitting this, here is both a ſacrifice and a feaſt upon it——A ſacrifice always accompanied by the feaſt, and inſeparable from it——The ſacrifice and feaſt of the ſame nature too, being both typical. And as the antient feaſts upon ſacrifices, *Jewiſh* and Heathen, were generally ſupplied by thoſe very ſacrifices, if not conſtantly; ſo the feaſt is neceſſarily ſupplied by the ſacrifice in the preſent inſtance: Which renders the analogy which the Lord's Supper bears to thoſe ſacrifices perfect and complete.

Laſtly, If the foregoing diſcourſe ſhall be thought to caſt any light on the ſubject of it——If it contributes to explain and aſcertain the nature of the bleſſed ſacrament——preſents it in a clearer view——exhibits a more diſtinct and preciſe notion of it——raiſes it to its juſt eſteem, which it much wanted——attributes neither too much, nor too little to it——If it be allowed in any reſpect to improve upon former treatiſes concerning this divine ordinance—Then it will have its uſe.

In proportion as this principal branch of the chriſtian worſhip is better underſtood it may be hoped it will more duly and frequently be reſorted to, and performed as *a reaſonable Service*; and that men will approach it with comfort and complacency, undiſturbed with thoſe dreads and terrors, which appear in too many countenances, to the great diſtraction of their devotion, on an occaſion which requires the greateſt compoſure of mind. The *right diſcerning of the Lord's Body* in the ſacrament will free ignorant and uninformed minds from that darkneſs and confuſion of ideas which is the ground of ſuch fears and diſtractions, and of all doubt and perplexity whatſoever. This, likewiſe, is the beſt remedy againſt all enthuſiaſtic and rapturous heights of devotion, which generally proceed from the ſame cauſe, together with an over-heated imagination.

On the other hand, a right information will guard againſt the unworthy reception and profane uſe of the ſacrament, and cauſe men to approach it with an awe and reverence becoming the great dignity of it; when they

they are once apprized of it. A due apprehenſion of it likewiſe will by degrees overcome men's indifference for, and neglect of, this holy inſtitution; and teach them to think more highly of the value and importance of it.

It will enliven our faith, and elevate our contemplations to reflect, that to give acceptance and efficacy to our work, in offering, and aſſiſting at the ſacrifice of the typical Body of Chriſt, He himſelf, at the ſame time, preſents the great archetype of his once crucified, now glorified Body, in Heaven; pleading the merits of it in our behalf at the throne of grace; and in virtue of it making interceſſion for us.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper being underſtood as a lively pourtrait and exhibition of our Lord's death, typically repreſenting the ſacrifice which he made of himſelf, better ſecures the great end and importance of it, by how much the more lively the manner is in which it is apprehended. The great and important end of

it is, that it may continue as a conſtant memorial of that ſacrifice in his church, throughout all ages, and *ſhew the Lord's death till he come:* Or, as I would chuſe to render the apoſtle's expreſſion——addreſſing himſelf to the church of *Corinth*, and in them to all other chriſtian churches—*as often*, ſays he, *as ye eat this bread and drink this cup*—In every celebration of the Euchariſt—καταγγελλετε, *ye announce* *, the Lord's death till he come—You preach Chriſt crucified—You are his heralds to the world—You avow your relation to him—You exhibit this witneſs of his paſſion † — You convey the memorial of

* In this ſenſe it preſerves the reſemblance between the Lord's Supper and the Paſſover, as obſerved above, P. 18. in another circumſtance beſides thoſe there taken Notice of. For at the celebration of the paſſover, there was a leſſon read, declaring the uſe and end of its inſtitution; which was termed הגדה, or the *Annunciation*. *V. Cyprian*'s Epiſt. lxiii. Ed. *Fell.* cum annot. ib. P. 151.

† Thus the apoſtle repreſents the two Sacraments as witneſſes, in conjunction with the Holy Spirit; which gives the greater ſanction to their teſtimony. *There are three that bear witneſs in earth; the Spirit, and the water*, in baptiſm; *and the blood*, in the Euchariſt, 1 *John* v. 8. Accordingly, in a primitive form of invocation, preſerved in the *Clementine* conſtitutions, for a bleſſing on the elements in the Euchariſt, it is called a ſacrifice, *witneſſing* the ſufferings of our Lord Jeſus—καταπεμψης το αγιον σε πνευμα επι την θυσιαν ταυτην, μαρτυρα των παθηματων τε Κυριε Ιησε. κ. τ. λ.

him

him from age to age, making one day to tell it another: And by this means our Lord's Death will continue freſh in the minds of his diſciples, through faith in the merits of it, till he comes again to judge the world, and receive his own glory.

May the Father of lights, and God of all wiſdom, illuminate our underſtandings with the light of his Holy Spirit, and lead us, even his whole church, with every branch and member of it into right apprehenſions of all things, relating to his will, and worſhip; and eſpecially of this higheſt act of worſhip, this moſt ſolemn ſervice of the ſanctuary; that we may all value it according to its due worth and eſtimation; and the better and more worthily bear our parts in it; in obedience to his command who inſtituted and enjoined it; and for his ſake who gives himſelf to us in it—*an offering and a ſacrifice to God for a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour*, Eph. v. 4. 'a full, perfect, and ſufficient ſacrifice, oblation, and ſatisfaction, for the ſins of the whole world'—*the lamb that was ſlain, and hath redeemed us to God by*

*his blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hath made us unto our God kings and prieſts*, Rev. v. 9, 10. —even our bleſſed Lord and only Saviour Jeſus Chriſt! *Amen.*

## *A* Prayer *that may be uſed at any Time before the partaking of the Lord's Supper.*

O MOST gracious and bountiful Lord God, who haſt prepared a feaſt of good things, for the ſtrengthening, refreſhing, and nouriſhing of our ſouls unto eternal life, and haſt invited and commanded us to eat and drink at thy table, to ſhew forth the Lord's Death, whereby he became a ſacrifice for the ſins of the world; and to repreſent unto thee that ſacrifice by the tokens of bread and wine, in which thou haſt appointed it to be ſet forth: Grant, I beſeech thee, O Lord, that I may (offer unto thee, and) feed upon this typical ſacrifice, with ſuch an unfeigned repentance of all my ſins, ſuch a lively faith in thy mercy, through the merits of my Saviour,

ſuch perfect charity with all men; ſuch a thankful remembrance of Chriſt's Death; ſuch true devotion and pure intention of heart and ſpirit, that I may be a true partaker of the great archetypal ſacrifice of his body and blood, which he once offered for our ſins upon the croſs here on earth; and ſtill continues to preſent as a propitiation for them unto thee in heaven; whereby I humbly hope and pray to obtain full pardon for all my ſins paſt, and grace to enable me to perform a more acceptable obedience to thy will for the time to come, through the merits and interceſſion of the ſame thy Son, Jeſus Chriſt our Lord. *Amen.*

*F I N I S.*

# ERRATA.

P. 6. Note, for μαγα, read μεγα.
P. 13. n. for *etam*, r. *etiam*.
P. 23. l. 3. The council of *Conſtantinople* here meant was that which met againſt images, A. D. 786.
P. 27. n. l. 5. for *cap.* iv. r. ix. The apoſtle here doth not expreſsly call the archetypes παραδειγματα; but he calls their types υποδειγματα, which amounts to the ſame thing.
—ib. n. l. ult. for *Acts* vii. 24. r. 44.
P. 50. n. l. 2. for *p.* 18. r. 19.
—ib. l. ult. for παθηματον, r. παθηματων.
P. 50. n. l. ult. *add*—Accordingly the church of *England*, in its articles of religion, Art. XXV. ſays of the ſacraments, that they are certain ſure witneſſes.

# ADDENDA.

A Diſcourſe, it ſeems, was publiſhed ſome years ago, "On the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper; wherein," was undertaken to be ſhewn, "in oppoſition to Dr *Warburton*, that it neither is, nor can be, of the nature of a feaſt on the ſacrifice." And in a late controverſial performance we are told, that "in this diſcourſe the learned author was ſuppoſed, by good judges, to have totally overthrown, and demonſtratively confuted Dr *W*——'s hypotheſis." This diſcourſe I never ſaw: But ſince the printing off theſe ſheets, I have ſeen the argument of it ſummed up in this apodictical ſyllogiſm, as it is called.

No ſin-offerings were permitted to be feaſted on by thoſe in whoſe behalf they were offered, *Lev.* vi. 30. *Heb.* xiii. 11, 12.

# ADDENDA.

But the death of Chriſt upon the croſs was a ſin-offering, offered in our behalf, *Rom.* v. 6. *Gal.* i. 4. *Heb.* ix. 26, 28.—xiii. 11, 12.

Therefore it cannot be feaſted on by us.

As deciſive as this argument may ſeem to others, it appears to me to be wrong: And therefore I think I owe it to truth to ſtate this matter in its juſt light; eſpecially as it ſo nearly relates to the ſubject of the foregoing diſcourſe; without reſpecting the perſons who hold the one opinion, or the other; equally wiſhing to each a greater portion of the ſpirit of peace, meekneſs, and moderation.

That the death of Chriſt cannot be feaſted on as a ſin-offering is granted: But it doth not therefore follow that it cannot be feaſted on at all. The fallacy in the above ſyllogiſm, which is brought in proof of that poſition, I apprehend, conſiſts in, that the concluſion contains more than the premiſes. Becauſe ſin-offerings could not be feaſted on by thoſe on whoſe behalf they were offered

offered—and the death of Chriſt was a ſin-offering, it follows only, that his death cannot be feaſted on as ſuch—not abſolutely, that it cannot be feaſted on in any ſenſe, or in any reſpect whatſoever.

In return for the above ſyllogiſm, here are two, they might be made three, which prove the contrary.

Peace—and free-will offerings were permitted to be feaſted on by thoſe, on whoſe behalf they were offered, *Lev.* iii. vii. 11—21.

But the death of Chriſt upon the croſs was a peace—and a free-will offering, *Eph.* ii. 14, 17. *Rom.* v. 1. *Gal.* i. 4. *John* x. 15—18. *Tit.* ii. 14. *Eph.* v. 25. 1 *Tim.* ii. 6. 1 *Pet.* ii. 24.

Therefore it may be feaſted on by us, as ſuch.

The paſſover was appointed to be feaſted on by thoſe on whoſe behalf it was offered. *Exod.* xii. 3—11.

*Chriſt*

# ADDENDA.

*Chriſt our paſſover was ſacrificed for us.* 1 Cor. v. 7.

*Therefore let us keep the feaſt*, ver. 8. of the Lord's Supper, on the death of Chriſt. We are not only permitted, but exhorted to do it. We are not only juſtified in ſo doing, but it becomes our duty.

Here both "the premiſes," and concluſion "are ſupported by direct and irrefragable authorities of holy ſcripture."